

## Trawl Exposure and Protection of Seabed Fauna at Large Spatial Scales

Mazor, Tessa; Pitcher, C. Roland; Ellis, Nick; Rochester, Wayne; Jennings, Simon; Hiddink, Jan; McConnaughey, Robert; Kaiser, Michel; Parma, Ana; Suuronen, Petri; Kangas, Mervi; Hilborn, R.

### Diversity and Distributions

DOI:

[10.1111/ddi.12622](https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12622)

Published: 01/11/2017

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

*Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):*

Mazor, T., Pitcher, C. R., Ellis, N., Rochester, W., Jennings, S., Hiddink, J., McConnaughey, R., Kaiser, M., Parma, A., Suuronen, P., Kangas, M., & Hilborn, R. (2017). Trawl Exposure and Protection of Seabed Fauna at Large Spatial Scales. *Diversity and Distributions*, 23(11), 1280-1291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12622>

#### Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Trawl Exposure and Protection of Seabed Fauna at Large Spatial Scales

Tessa Mazor<sup>1</sup>, C. Roland Pitcher<sup>1</sup>, Nick Ellis<sup>1</sup>, Wayne Rochester<sup>1</sup>, Simon Jennings<sup>2,3</sup>, Jan Geert Hiddink<sup>4</sup>, Robert A. McConnaughey<sup>5</sup>, Michel Kaiser<sup>4</sup>, Ana Parma<sup>6</sup>, Petri Suuronen<sup>7</sup>, Mervi Kangas<sup>8</sup>, Ray Hilborn<sup>9</sup>

1. CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Brisbane, Australia; [tessa.mazor@csiro.au](mailto:tessa.mazor@csiro.au); [nick\\_ellis@optusnet.com.au](mailto:nick_ellis@optusnet.com.au); [wayne.rochester@csiro.au](mailto:wayne.rochester@csiro.au); [roland.pitcher@csiro.au](mailto:roland.pitcher@csiro.au)
2. Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science, Lowestoft, UK; [simon.jennings@ices.dk](mailto:simon.jennings@ices.dk)
3. School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK
4. School of Ocean Sciences, Bangor University, Menai Bridge, Wales, UK; [j.hiddink@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:j.hiddink@bangor.ac.uk); [michel.kaiser@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:michel.kaiser@bangor.ac.uk)
5. RACE Division, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Seattle, Washington, USA; [bob.mcconnaughey@noaa.gov](mailto:bob.mcconnaughey@noaa.gov)
6. Centro Nacional Patagónico, Puerto Madryn Chubut, Argentina; [parma@cenpat.edu.ar](mailto:parma@cenpat.edu.ar)
7. FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Rome, Italy; [petri.suuronen@fao.org](mailto:petri.suuronen@fao.org)
8. Department of Fisheries, Western Australia; [mervi.kangas@fish.wa.gov.au](mailto:mervi.kangas@fish.wa.gov.au)
9. University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA; [rayh@uw.edu](mailto:rayh@uw.edu)

**Key Words:** *Australian benthic fauna, benthic invertebrates, fisheries management, fishery closures, marine conservation, marine reserves, species distribution modelling, trawl fisheries.*

**Running-title:** Trawl Exposure and Protection of Benthos

**Word count for abstract:** 299

**Word count main text:** 4885

**Number of references:** 50

## Corresponding author:

Tessa Mazor

CSIRO Oceans & Atmosphere Flagship

Ecosciences Precinct 41 Boggo Road, Dutton Park

QLD 4102, Australia

Phone: +61 7 3833 5626

E-mail: [tessa.mazor@csiro.au](mailto:tessa.mazor@csiro.au)

## ABSTRACT

**Aim:** Trawling leads to widespread direct human disturbance on the seabed. Knowledge of the extent and consequences of this disturbance is limited because large-scale distributions of seabed fauna are not well-known. We map faunal distributions in the Australian Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) and quantify the proportion of their abundance that occurs in areas 1) that are directly trawled, and 2) where legislation permanently prohibits trawling — defined as percentage *exposure* or *protection* respectively. Our approach includes developing a method that integrates data from disparate seabed surveys to spatially expand predicted benthos distributions.

**Location:** Australia

**Methods:** We collate data from 18 seabed surveys to map the distribution of seabed invertebrates (benthos) in nine regions. Our approach combines data from multiple surveys, groups taxa within taxonomic classes, and uses Random Forests to predict spatial abundance distributions of benthos groups from environmental variables. Exposure and protection of benthos groups were quantified by mapping their predicted abundance distributions against the footprint of trawling and legislated boundaries of marine reserves and fishery closures.

**Results:** Trawling is currently prohibited from more area of Australia's EEZ (58%) than is trawled (<5%). Across 134 benthos-groups, 96% had greater protection of abundance than exposure. The mean trawl exposure of benthos-group abundance was 7%, compared to mean protection of 38%; whereas the mean abundance neither trawled nor protected was 55%. Fishery closures covered 19% less study area than marine reserves, but overlapped with a higher proportion (5% more) of benthos-group abundance.

**Main Conclusions:** This study provides the most extensive quantitative assessment of the current exposure of Australia's benthos to trawling. Further, it highlights the contribution of

fishery closures to marine conservation. These results help identify regions and taxa that are at greatest potential risk from trawling, and supports managers to achieve balance between conservation and sustainable industries in marine ecosystems.

## INTRODUCTION

Seabed fauna are critical for the functioning of marine ecosystems. Seabed invertebrates (benthos) help oxygenate the sea floor, break down organic material, provide habitat structure and food sources for other organisms (Tagliapietra & Sigovini, 2010). Accordingly, benthos are often used as indicators for assessing the status and health of marine ecosystems (Rosenberg *et al.*, 2004). From a human perspective, benthos support a range of commercial industries (Hiddink *et al.*, 2011; Choi & Joon Choi, 2012). However, many benthic species are sensitive to disturbance; thus, the extent and intensity of human activity in marine ecosystems can ultimately disrupt the services that benthos provide (Thrush & Dayton, 2002). While the importance of benthos in marine ecosystems is recognized, their distributions and extent of threats on them are largely unknown, particularly across large spatial scales.

Seabed trawling and dredging (hereafter “trawling”) yield ~25% of global seafood catches (FAO, 2009), yet are considered the most widespread human source of direct physical disturbance to benthos (Hinz *et al.*, 2009). Much research has focused on investigating the impacts of trawling on benthic species and communities (Kaiser *et al.*, 2006). Experimental and comparative studies indicate that trawling reduces species abundance and biomass (BurrIDGE *et al.*, 2003; Kaiser *et al.*, 2006), and can lead to longer-term restructuring of benthic communities (Hiddink *et al.*, 2006a; Hinz *et al.*, 2009). While there is much debate about the severity and extent of trawl impacts (Hilborn, 2007), rather few studies have measured these on large scales (>50 km<sup>2</sup>) where spatial variation in trawling intensity will influence the aggregate impact (Jennings *et al.*, 2001; Hiddink *et al.*, 2006a; Pitcher *et al.*, 2016a).

Marine reserves and fishery closures are two management tools that are used to protect species and habitats from human disturbance (Rice, 2005). Previously, marine reserve designation was largely opportunistic (Roberts *et al.*, 2003), but now systematic approaches that take account of biota distributions may be used for planning spatial closures (Schmiing *et al.*, 2014). Even though closures and reserves may not be specifically established for protection and conservation of benthos, they may provide fortuitous benefits (Pitcher *et al.*, 2007a). Protected areas that are not located in areas of high benthos abundance or diversity may have little benefit for the state of benthic ecosystems, and can have negative effects if fishing is displaced to benthos rich areas (Pitcher *et al.*, 2015). Thus, benefits for benthos cannot be assumed, and distributions of benthic habitats and fauna should be assessed and incorporated when planning spatial closures (Hiddink *et al.*, 2006b).

Knowledge of the large-scale distribution of benthos is essential for impact assessments, conservation and management. Given incomplete knowledge of benthic distributions and the challenge of large-scale and high-resolution sampling (Fisher *et al.*, 2011), models are often developed and used to predict species distributions beyond sampled sites (Elith & Leathwick, 2009). Attempts to apply these models are often constrained by sparse and patchy survey data, often only available as presence/absence or even presence-only records and at coarse taxonomic resolution (Compton *et al.*, 2013). Despite investment in some large-scale benthic surveys in Australia (Pitcher *et al.*, 2007b; Pitcher *et al.*, 2016b), it is not feasible to address all constraints. Hence, alternative methods need to be adopted for predicting distributions and trawling impacts in data-limited situations, and to expand the extent of assessed regions. Advances in the use of data-limited approaches for making large-scale predictions of benthos distributions would enable management decisions on the mitigation of seabed impacts in more areas of the world.

130

131 We aim to quantify, across large spatial scales, the proportion of benthos abundance currently  
132 distributed in areas that are trawled — defined as *exposure* — and in marine reserves or  
133 fishery closure areas where legislation permanently prohibits trawling — defined as  
134 *protection*. Our analysis is based on benthos distributions predicted from seabed survey data.  
135 We also develop approaches to utilize sparse and disparate datasets with the intention of  
136 expanding the spatial extent of distribution mapping — an approach that can be widely  
137 applicable elsewhere. Here we focus on the Australian Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ),  
138 where the diversity of environments and seabed fauna is high (Ponder *et al.*, 2002), and  
139 management measures are already influencing the distribution of trawling activity; including  
140 large MPAs (e.g. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park: Day & Dobbs, 2013; Commonwealth  
141 Marine Reserves: Department of the Environment, 2016) and ecosystem-based fisheries  
142 management (McLoughlin *et al.*, 2008).

143

## 144 **METHODS**

145 Large-scale distributions of benthos were modelled and predicted from available surveys and  
146 environmental variables across Australia’s EEZ. We sought to maximise the extent of  
147 predictions by utilising data from disparate surveys (e.g. different sampling devices,  
148 abundance metrics, locations and levels of taxonomic resolution). Benthos taxa were  
149 aggregated to the rank of class — the taxonomic resolution consistently recorded among  
150 datasets and with reported trawl-sensitivities (Collie *et al.*, 2000). Within classes, taxa were  
151 grouped according to their correspondence with assemblages of sites and their abundance  
152 data were aggregated and modelled. Finally, benthos group distributions were mapped and

used to quantify the proportion of their abundance that overlaps with the trawl footprint (exposure) and trawl closed areas (protection).

## **Collating large-scale datasets across Australia**

We collated available data across Australia's continental EEZ (9.14 million km<sup>2</sup>, Fig. 1) for large-scale benthic surveys, trawl footprint, trawl closed areas and environmental variables (predictors).

### *Benthic surveys*

Invertebrate data were obtained from 18 benthic surveys in nine Australian regions (Fig. 1; Table S1 in Supporting Information). These data were collected from 3200 sites by four gear types: beam trawl (119 sites), grab (462 sites), epibenthic sled (2438), and prawn trawl (1028 sites). The taxonomic classes that comprised the largest number of sampled taxa were used in analyses: Bivalvia, Demospongiae, Echinoidea, Gastropoda, Gymnolaemata, Holothuroidea, Malacostraca, Ophiuroidea and Polychaeta. The number of taxa identified in each survey ranged from 277 to 4067, and their abundances were recorded as counts or weight, usually standardised by sampled area.

### *Trawl footprint*

Trawl effort data for 3–5 years in 2007–2012 were acquired from the relevant authorities responsible for management of each fishery (Table S2). Average annual trawl effort in hours per 0.01° grid cell (~1.1 km) was re-scaled to total swept area, based on the gear swept-width and towing speeds for each fishery. Total annual swept area was divided by grid area to give the swept-area ratio  $F$  of each cell. Trawl footprints were estimated in two ways: (1) by assuming trawling was randomly distributed within cells, thus the trawled proportion of each



cell is  $1-e^{-F}$  and is representative of the annual trawl footprint, and (2) by assuming trawling is uniformly distributed within cells, thus the trawled proportion of each cell is  $F$  if  $F < 1$ , otherwise 1, and is representative of a multi-year trawl footprint (for details see Pitcher *et al.*, 2016c; Pitcher *et al.*, 2016d).

#### *Trawl closed areas*

All available data on the location of marine reserves/parks and fishery closures were collated for the Australian EEZ (Table S3; Table S4). We examined each management and zoning plan to include only spatial areas that permanently prohibit trawl fishing. All areas that prohibit trawling were combined and mapped using ArcGIS (ESRI, 2014). We note that for many Commonwealth Marine Reserves protection is planned but not yet in effect.

#### *Environmental data*

Environmental data for modelling and predicting the distribution of benthos comprised 37 environmental variables mapped to the Australian EEZ on a  $0.01^\circ$  grid (Table S5). Predictors that did not vary among surveyed sites ( $SD=0$ ) or were missing for parts of a region were excluded from individual analyses.

### **Statistical methods**

Benthos distributions were modelled and predicted using Random Forests (RF), an ensemble of decision trees with binary splits (Breiman, 2001). Analyses were implemented in the R computing environment (R Core Team, 2015) using package ‘randomForest’ (Liaw & Wiener, 2002). Importance of each predictor was calculated as the increase in Out-of-Bag (OOB) mean squared error (MSE) when the values of the predictor were randomly permuted. We used conditional importance as implemented in ‘extendedForest’ to take into account

correlations between predictors (Ellis *et al.* 2012). Model performance (measured by OOB  $R^2$ ) was improved in all analyses by iteratively excluding predictors with low importance until OOB  $R^2$  stopped improving. We optimized the number of terminal nodes of trees ('maxnodes') by iteratively fitting RFs with maxnodes increasing from 1, in blocks of 10, until OOB  $R^2$  decreased for two consecutive blocks. The number of terminal nodes associated with the highest OOB  $R^2$  was selected for the final model.

## **Predicting benthos distributions**

Nine regions on the continental shelf of Australia (area = 1.44 million km<sup>2</sup>; ~16% of EEZ; Fig. 1) were assessed based on the availability of large-scale benthic survey datasets (Table S1). Each study region was bounded by the latitude, longitude and depth-range of surveyed sites. Analyses for each region followed a three-step process: arranging data-matrices, grouping taxa and predicting current benthos distributions using RF (Fig. 2; Appendix S1 – R code example).

### Step 1. Arranging data into a matrix

The RF analyses required a site-by-taxon matrix (biomass or count data) for each of the nine regions. Three approaches based on the complexity of regional survey datasets were used to produce the matrix (Appendix S1).

#### *i) Single gear approach*

For regions where benthos were sampled with one gear type (e.g. sled, prawn trawl or grab), abundance data were arranged into a conventional site-by-taxon matrix.

#### *ii) Multiple gears approach*

222 In some regions, multiple gears were used to sample benthos at the same sites. Where surveys  
223 used two devices that had substantive overlap in species composition, taxa data were  
224 combined by accounting for catchability differences between gears (note: epifauna and  
225 infauna, e.g. trawls vs grabs were not combined). A multiplicative scaling-factor was  
226 estimated for each taxon sampled by both gears, using an iterative process, similar to Chen *et*  
227 *al.* (2007): (i) an initial scaling-factor, equivalent to the back-transformed difference between  
228 gear means of the log-transformed data, was used to rescale abundance (on the natural scale)  
229 for the gear with lower catchability, (ii) a random forest (RF) was fitted to the log-  
230 transformed re-scaled data-matrix, with all environmental variables as predictors to account  
231 for environmental influences on abundance; (iii) an incremental scaling-factor was estimated  
232 by minimising least squares on the residuals of the RF fit, then back-transformed and used to  
233 re-scale the rescaled data-matrix again. Steps two and three were repeated until the  
234 incremental scaling-factor converged. The final scaling-factor for each taxon was estimated  
235 as the cumulative-product of the initial and incremental scaling-factors. Both gear-types were  
236 considered to sample the taxon with adequate reliability for scaling-factors in the range 0.2 –  
237 5, and data from both gears were used by scaling-up abundances for the gear with lower  
238 catchability. If scaling factors were outside this range, data from the lower catchability gear  
239 was considered too unreliable and we used data only from the gear having the higher  
240 catchability. Where the same sites were sampled with two gears, we calculated the mean site  
241 abundances of each taxon after scaling-up the data from the gear with lower catchability. If  
242 sites were not all sampled by both gears a ‘hybrid’ site-by-taxon matrix was created, where  
243 for taxa requiring a scaling-factor, data were the mean of the observed and rescaled  
244 abundances at all sites (averaged at sites with both gears), and for taxa sampled with only one  
245 gear, data were the observed abundances, and at sites sampled by the other gear abundances  
246 were estimated with RF modelling.

247

248 Subsequent calculations on the hybrid matrix required abundance data on the natural scale.  
249 However, where predicted abundances were used, the back-transformation introduces a bias  
250 and a correction factor is required to adjust predicted values (Cowpertwait & Metcalfe,  
251 2009). Hence, we applied an empirical adjustment factor on the natural scale, estimated from  
252 the ratio of the mean of the observed values and the mean of their corresponding back-  
253 transformed predicted values.

254 *iii) Disparate datasets approach*

255 In some regions benthos were sampled by multiple surveys that, although spatially  
256 interspersed, were disparate in: spatial extent, time, taxonomic resolution and identification,  
257 sampling device and abundance metrics. These datasets could not be cross-standardised nor  
258 could taxa be merged. To integrate these disparate datasets, we fitted RF models (log  
259 response) for each taxon within each survey dataset separately, with environmental variables  
260 as predictors. These RF models were used to predict each taxon's abundance at sites sampled  
261 by all other surveys. Predictions were then back-transformed to the natural scale, applying an  
262 adjustment factor as described in the previous section. Thus a 'hybrid' site-by-taxon matrix  
263 was created with observed abundances where available, otherwise predicted abundances.

264

265 Because the disparate surveys could not be standardised, we normalised the hybrid matrices  
266 via a series of scalings: 1) the abundance of each taxon (including rare taxa) was divided by  
267 its total abundance so that across surveyed sites each taxon's abundance summed to one.  
268 Next, 2) each taxon was scaled by the proportion of abundance it comprised of its own survey  
269 dataset, so that each dataset summed to one. Finally, 3) these values were multiplied by the  
270 total number of taxa in the dataset, so that each dataset summed to the total number of taxa

comprising that dataset. The normalised hybrid matrices, now with the same number of sites, were joined together to provide a single hybrid matrix.

## Step 2: Determining benthos groups

We aggregated taxa at taxonomic class level because of: taxonomic inconsistencies among datasets, reported sensitivities of benthos to trawling, and to provide concise presentation of results. However, different species within classes can have very different distributions. Thus, within classes, we grouped taxa with similar distributions so that resulting distributions more usefully reflect distributions of constituent species. Various methods exist that can group taxa based on the correlation of their abundances at sites, but most do not objectively define the number of groups. Multivariate Regression Trees (MRT; De'ath, 2012) provide an objective method for grouping sites based on the sampled abundances of taxa and their relationships with environmental variables. Hence, first we grouped sites using MRT, then assigned taxa to site-group assemblages using the Dufrêne & Legendre (1997) indicator-species metric (DLI).

### *(i) Group sites by multivariate regression trees*

MRTs (R package 'mvpart'; De'ath, 2012), group sites by minimizing heterogeneity in multi-taxon composition data through repeated splitting on environmental values. The response variables were the site-by-taxon matrix (or hybrid matrix), log-transformed, excluding rare taxa (presence at <5 sites). Tree size (number of terminal nodes = groups) was selected by cross-validation, using the "1SE" criterion, which indicates the smallest tree having prediction error within one standard error of the minimum cross-validated error. The terminal nodes of the tree represent site-group assemblages of taxa, with homogeneity of composition defined by this criterion.

### *ii) Assign taxa to groups and aggregate abundance*

We calculated the DLI metric of the relative frequency and abundance of each taxon for each site group (function ‘indval’ in R package ‘labdsv’; Roberts, 2010), based on the site-by-taxon matrix on the natural scale (created in Step 1). We assigned each taxon to the group in which it attained its highest DLI score. This also enabled inclusion of rare taxa and assignment of them to the appropriate group. Group abundance was calculated by summing taxon abundances (on the natural scale) at sites from the site-by-taxon matrix.

### Step 3: Predicting benthos distributions

The abundance distributions of benthos groups were modelled with RF. Where model performance indicated a meaningful level of prediction success (cross-validated OOB  $R^2 \geq 5\%$ ), we used the model to predict and map the current distribution of benthos groups to a regional-scale grid of environmental variables. The influence of variables in each benthos-group model was obtained from the RF predictor importance measure (%IncMSE). We summarized predictor importance across models by scaling importance by its proportionate contribution to model performance (OOB  $R^2$ ) for each benthos group. These proportions were then averaged across all models, per region and per class to estimate overall predictor importance.

### **Calculating benthos trawl exposure and protection**

Benthos group abundance distributions were mapped (on a  $0.01^\circ$  grid) against trawl footprints and boundaries of areas closed to trawling to quantify their trawl *exposure* and *protection*. Specifically, we quantified *exposure* by summing the predicted group abundance in trawled grid cells, calculating the trawled proportion of each cell (calculated using both the random and uniform methods, to represent the annual and multi-year exposure respectively),

and dividing by total group abundance. *Protection* was quantified by summing group abundance in cells identified to permanently prohibit trawling via legislated fishery closures, marine reserves or both, and dividing by total group abundance. We also quantified the proportion of group abundance in cells neither trawled nor protected.

## RESULTS

### Prediction performance and important predictors

The performance of RF prediction models (Fig. S1; Fig. S2) varied widely among benthos groups within all regions. The OOB  $R^2$  values tended to be highest for Exmouth Gulf & Shark Bay and lowest for Pilbara Coast (Fig. S1). The most important predictor across all benthos models was sediment sand fraction (Fig. S3; Fig. S4). Other important variables were bottom-water temperature and oxygen concentration, surface photosynthetically active radiation, sediment gravel and mud fractions. Predictor importance varied widely across the nine regions, such that the most important predictor for each region was different, but sediment properties (sand, mud, gravel) were always among the most important predictors (Fig. S3). Across taxonomic classes, predictor importance was less variable (Fig. S4). Sand was the most important predictor for class Bivalvia, Ophiuroidea, Malacostraca and Polychaeta; gravel was the most important variable for Demospongiae and Gymnolaemata; and the annual average bottom-water temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) was most important for Echinoidea, Gastropoda and Holothuroidea.

### Trawl exposure and protection across Australia's EEZ

Trawl fishing is prohibited from 57.9% of Australia's EEZ; marine reserves cover 37.2% of the EEZ and fishery closures cover 30.3%, with a 9.5% overlap of both (Fig. 3). The recent national annual and multi-year trawl footprints are 0.9% and 1.1% of Australia's entire EEZ, and the area of grid-cells in which any trawl effort is recorded is 4.4% of the EEZ. Thus, ~37.7% of the EEZ is neither trawled nor protected.

### **Trawl exposure and protection across study regions**

The proportion of trawled and protected areas varied substantially among the nine case-study regions (Fig. 4; Table S6). Regions having the highest proportion of protection were the Great Barrier Reef followed by Exmouth Gulf & Shark Bay. The areas with least protection were the Pilbara Coast and Gulf of Carpentaria. The highest proportion of trawl footprints were in Exmouth Gulf & Shark Bay and the lowest were in the Great Australian Bight and West Coast — other regions were intermediate. The predicted distributions of benthos groups differed within regions, thus their protection and trawl exposure varied, including between groups within taxonomic classes. For example, the variation between three different distribution groups of sea urchin (Echinoidea) taxa in the Gulf of Carpentaria (Fig. 5).

Protection and exposure also ranged widely across all 134 benthos groups for which distributions were predicted and mapped by this study (Table S7; Table S8). As a proportion of their abundance, almost all benthos groups (129/134; 96%) had higher protection from trawling (mean=38%; median=40%) than exposure to trawling (mean=6.5%; median=3.2%; Fig. 6). Only five benthos groups, in four regions, had higher exposure than protection. In all five cases, a greater proportion of their abundance was neither trawled nor protected. Indeed, overall, the greatest proportion of group abundances occurred in areas that were neither



protected nor trawled (mean for all 134 groups =55.5%). Among regions, there tended to be a consistency of protection and exposure related to the extent of trawling and reserved/closed areas within the study region. However, across all regions, there was no apparent pattern of protection or exposure related to taxonomic classes (Fig. 6b).

Comparing across regions, benthos in Exmouth Gulf & Shark Bay had the highest exposure to trawling (mean=26.7%; Fig. 6a); yet, this region had comparably high protection (mean=43.1%), primarily due to extensive fishery closures. In contrast, benthos in Pilbara Coast had the least protection, but also low exposure to trawling. Benthos groups in the Great Barrier Reef had the highest protection by marine reserves compared to other regions, but its trawl fishery closures have been fully incorporated into its protected areas, so combined protection of its benthos groups (mean=52%) was similar to that of several other study regions (Fig. 6a).

Regions having the most variation in protection among benthos groups included the Great Barrier Reef (min =13%, max=80%) and Spencer Gulf (min=4%, max=79%) (Fig. 6a), reflecting widely differing benthos group distributions in relation to reserves and closures. The least variation occurred in the South East (min=33%, max=56%), and Pilbara Coast regions (min=3%, max=26%). In all regions, variation in benthos trawl exposure was considerably less than variation in benthos protection. The largest trawl variation was in the Great Barrier Reef and Exmouth Gulf & Shark Bay, and the smallest variation in the Great Australian Bight and West Coast.

Over all benthos groups, greater protection of their abundance was provided by fishery closures (mean=23%; median=20%) than by marine reserves (mean=22%; median=14%; Fig. 6a). This was despite fishery closures covering 19% less area than marine reserves (17.7% vs 21.9%; Table S6). However, slightly more individual benthos groups, by number, had greater protection of abundance in marine reserves (77/134; 57%) than in fishery closures (57/134; 43%). Exposure to scallop dredging occurred only in the Southeast region and was minimal (max exposure <0.1%; Table S8); hence this gear-type was excluded from presentation of results.

## DISCUSSION

This study provides the most extensive quantitative assessment of the current trawl exposure and protection of Australia's benthic invertebrates. The exposure of most Australian benthos to trawling was relatively low, whereas benthos protection was typically about 6-fold higher. However, for most benthos groups more than half of their benthos abundance was neither protected nor trawled, highlighting the importance of untrawled open areas when considering trawl-impact risks. Our results imply that overall, Australia's benthos may be at low risk from trawling. Although, we caution that the results indicate potential rather than realised risks to sustainability and, while the potential risks appeared low overall, there were some cases of higher exposure and lower protection. Further, exposure and protection alone do not account for the sensitivity of benthos to trawl impacts or their capacity to recover. The typically low exposures observed do, nevertheless, suggest that even if impacts in trawled areas were high and recovery was slow, large proportions of abundance outside trawled areas may sustain most benthos at regional scales.

412

413 While trawling is prohibited over a large proportion (58%) of Australia's EEZ, most of these  
414 areas are located in waters deeper than 1,000 m where no bottom trawling occurs (Pitcher,  
415 2016). The proportion of area closed to trawling was substantially lower in our shallower  
416 study regions (33%, Table S6). Similarly, the national footprint of all Australian trawling as a  
417 proportion of the entire EEZ (at ~1% trawled, or 4.7% area of grid-cells with effort) is  
418 smaller than the trawl footprints in our study regions (at ~3% trawled, or 14% area of grid-  
419 cells with effort; Table S6). Thus, the high proportion of area protected at the EEZ scale  
420 cannot be assumed at regional scales, where local protection and risks must be quantified to  
421 guide appropriate management actions. Other pressures besides trawling that may affect  
422 benthic fauna should also be considered, such as coastal pollution, acidification and climate  
423 change (Hiddink *et al.*, 2015).

424

425 Fishery legislated closures are often overlooked as a marine conservation tool (Ward &  
426 Hegerl, 2003). The contribution of fishery closures to management of commercial stocks is  
427 generally well accepted (Stefansson & Rosenberg, 2005), but they can also provide habitat  
428 protection (Asch & Collie, 2008). Our study highlights their contribution to protection of  
429 Australia's benthos. Interestingly, we found that fishery closures provide higher protection of  
430 benthos abundance than marine reserves, despite their smaller coverage of the study regions.  
431 This may be due to the strategic placement of fishery closures targeting fisheries stock  
432 management or productive nursery habitats. While our results indicate that fishery closures  
433 contribute to benthos protection, the best sustainability outcomes are achieved when a variety  
434 of management tools are applied (e.g. effort reductions, catch limits and permanent/temporal  
435 spatial closures (Hiddink *et al.*, 2006b; Dichmont *et al.*, 2013; Pitcher *et al.*, 2015).

436

437 The synthesis presented here enables broad-scale comparisons across regions. The region  
438 with the greatest protection of benthos abundance was the Great Barrier Reef. Interestingly,  
439 one form of protection (either reserves or closure) dominated benthos protection in each  
440 region with the exception of the West Coast, the only region with relatively equal protection  
441 of benthos by reserves and closures. Exmouth Gulf & Shark Bay had the most extensive  
442 relative trawl footprint and its benthos had the highest exposure to trawling. However,  
443 protection provided by closures in this region was relatively high, offsetting the high  
444 exposure. In contrast, benthos in the adjacent Pilbara Coast had the lowest trawl exposure,  
445 even though this region did not have the smallest trawl footprint. Thus, while the regional  
446 extent of reserves/closures and trawl footprints did influence overall benthos protection and  
447 exposure, the distributions of individual benthos groups differed substantially within regions  
448 and directly affected individual group protection and exposure (e.g. Fig. 5; Fig. 6). Hence,  
449 understanding the potential risk of trawling requires information on distributions, since  
450 benthos exposure cannot be assumed from trawl footprint alone.

451

452 Patterns of exposure and protection appeared unrelated to taxonomic class. However,  
453 distribution relationships with environmental variables did tend to show patterns related to  
454 class. Moreover, sediment (sand and gravel) were particularly important for six of nine taxa  
455 groups. In comparison, the most important predictors varied widely by region, but sediment and  
456 bottom-water properties were prevalent. These findings are consistent with other observations  
457 of strong associations between sediment properties and benthos composition, richness and  
458 diversity (Collie *et al.*, 2000; Sutcliffe *et al.*, 2014). Thus, we recommend studies aiming to  
459 predict benthos distributions prioritise the collection of sediment and bottom water properties.

460

461 Defining the extent of study area boundaries is a vexed issue for many spatial studies (Piet &  
462 Quirijns, 2009). Our choice of study areas was limited to the extent of existing benthic  
463 surveys to avoid extrapolating beyond the data range. However, our results would differ if we  
464 used different boundaries such as large marine ecosystems (LMEs;  
465 <http://www.lme.noaa.gov/>), marine ecoregions (Spalding *et al.*, 2007), or fisheries  
466 management regions (Pitcher *et al.*, 2016d). For example, in the Great Australian Bight there  
467 are trawl fishery closures at depths less than 10 m, yet our study region did not encompass  
468 such shallow depths due to the distribution of surveyed sites. If it did, perhaps our results  
469 would have indicated higher protection for benthic taxa, although it is also likely that  
470 taxonomic composition would differ at shallower depths. Therefore, study area boundaries  
471 need to be carefully considered in the context of relevant management questions.

472

473 There are inherent limitations when conducting large-scale spatial studies that integrate  
474 scarce available survey data and rely on modelling to predict distributions. First, available  
475 data may be biased towards the objectives of the initial survey. For example, fishery-  
476 dependent data are often relied upon and, in the case of Exmouth Gulf & Shark Bay, the  
477 surveys were largely confined to the active trawl grounds, resulting in the higher relative  
478 trawl footprints for that region in our study. Second, it is implicit that some details observed  
479 by finer-scale studies will not be picked up by a large, cross-regional study. Moreover, we  
480 aggregated benthos into groups, which would inherently introduce additional uncertainty  
481 compared with species-level analyses (Pearman *et al.*, 2010). Nevertheless, our broad cross-  
482 regional finding that trawl exposure was low and protection was high, is consistent with  
483 species-level regional analyses (Pitcher *et al.*, 2007b; Pitcher *et al.*, 2015; Pitcher *et al.*,

2016b). Third, modelling and predicting regional benthos distributions will always introduce uncertainty due to sampling variability/error in source data, imperfect relationships between benthos and environment and biological/ecological processes among others. For these reasons, we report the OOB prediction performance of benthos models (Fig. S1; Fig. S2), and acknowledge uncertainty in the estimates of protection and exposure. If such limitations can be minimised, the greatest impediment limiting large-scale assessments is actually the availability of suitable survey data. We anticipate that as more data are deposited in the evolving database repositories, more large-scale assessments of trawling may be feasible.

In conclusion, we discovered greater proportions of benthos abundance in our study regions were distributed in protected and/or closed areas rather than in trawled areas. Our study also highlights the importance of fishery closures in providing protection for benthic invertebrates. These results are a first step in quantifying large-scale risks and impacts of trawling on benthos and can help managers identify priorities for focusing future status assessments. Future work should expand our analysis to quantify risk from trawling and determine whether benthos are sustainable under the current regimes of exposure and protection. Such future quantitative sustainability assessments can help managers identify if any taxa and regions may be at higher risk from trawling, determine the effectiveness of current management, and guide decisions about the need for future management measures. Our approach for combining scarce and disparate benthic invertebrate data into distribution models can be widely applied to other marine taxa and regions where data are sparse and trade-offs with anthropogenic pressures need to be assessed. Such analysis can help managers achieve balance between conservation and sustainable industries in marine ecosystems.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

TM was supported by a CSIRO Post-Doctoral Fellowship; co-authors acknowledge their organizations for salary support. We are thankful to data contributors (Tables S1, S2, S3, S4 and S5).

## **DATA ACCESSIBILITY**

Benthic survey data sources are provided in Table S1. Trawl effort data are confidential and source information is in Table S2. Marine reserve and Fishery closure data are available from sources provided in Table S3 and Table S4. Environmental predictor data are available from sources provided in Table S5.

## **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

TM, CRP, NE and WR conceived the ideas; TM and CRP collated the data, TM analysed the data. All authors contributed to the writing, led by TM.

## **BIOSKETCH**

Tessa Mazor is a postdoctoral fellow at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO). The fellowship project aims to conduct both national and global quantitative ecological risk assessments of trawling, working with the Ocean and Atmosphere research team and linking to a multi-national project “Trawling: finding common ground on the scientific knowledge regarding best practices” (<http://trawlingpractices.wordpress.com>).

530

531

532



## REFERENCES

- Asch, R.G. & Collie, J.S. (2008) Changes in a benthic megafaunal community due to disturbance from bottom fishing and the establishment of a fishery closure. *Fishery Bulletin*, **106**, 438-456.
- Breiman, L. (2001) Random forests. *Machine Learning*, **45**, 5-32.
- Burridge, C.Y., Pitcher, C.R., Wassenberg, T.J., Poiner, I.R. & Hill, B.J. (2003) Measurement of the rate of depletion of benthic fauna by prawn (shrimp) otter trawls: an experiment in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Fisheries Research*, **60**, 237-253.
- Chen, J., Yu, K., Hsing, A. & Therneau, T.M. (2007) A partially linear tree-based regression model for assessing complex joint gene–gene and gene–environment effects. *Genetic Epidemiology*, **31**, 238-251.
- Choi, B.-D. & Joon Choi, Y. (2012) 2 Nutraceutical Functionalities of Polysaccharides from Marine Invertebrates. *Advances in food and nutrition research*, **65**, 11-30.
- Collie, J.S., Hall, S.J., Kaiser, M.J. & Poiner, I.R. (2000) A quantitative analysis of fishing impacts on shelf-sea benthos. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **69**, 785-798.
- Compton, T.J., Bowden, D.A., Pitcher, C.R., Hewitt, J.E. & Ellis, N. (2013) Biophysical patterns in benthic assemblage composition across contrasting continental margins off New Zealand. *Journal of Biogeography*, **40**, 75-89.
- Cowpertwait, P.S. & Metcalfe, A.V. (2009) *Introductory time series with R*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Day, J.C. & Dobbs, K. (2013) Effective governance of a large and complex cross-jurisdictional marine protected area: Australia's Great Barrier Reef. *Marine Policy*, **41**, 14-24.
- De'ath, G. (2012) *mvpart: Multivariate partitioning. R package version 1.6-0*. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mvpart>
- Department of the Environment (2016) *Commonwealth marine reserves*. Available at: <http://www.environment.gov.au/topics/marine/marine-reserves> (accessed Jun 2016 2016).
- Dichmont, C.M., Ellis, N., Bustamante, R.H., Deng, R., Tickell, S., Pascual, R., Lozano-Montes, H. & Griffiths, S. (2013) Evaluating marine spatial closures with conflicting fisheries and conservation objectives. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **50**, 1060-1070.
- Elith, J. & Leathwick, J.R. (2009) Species Distribution Models: Ecological Explanation and Prediction Across Space and Time. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, **40**, 677-697.
- Ellis, N., Smith, S.J. & Pitcher, C.R. (2012) Gradient Forests: calculating importance gradients on physical predictors. *Ecology*, **93**, 156–168.

569 ESRI (2014) *ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10.2.2*. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems  
570 Research Institute.

571 FAO (2009) The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2008. Food and Agricultural  
572 Organization (FAO), Rome, p. 176p. In:

573 Fisher, R., Knowlton, N., Brainard, R.E. & Caley, M.J. (2011) Differences among Major  
574 Taxa in the Extent of Ecological Knowledge across Four Major Ecosystems. *PLoS*  
575 *ONE*, **6**, e26556.

576 Hiddink, J.G., Burrows, M.T. & Molinos, J.G. (2015) Temperature tracking by North Sea  
577 benthic invertebrates in response to climate change. *Global Change Biology*, **21**, 117-  
578 129.

579 Hiddink, J.G., Hutton, T., Jennings, S. & Kaiser, M.J. (2006b) Predicting the effects of area  
580 closures and fishing effort restrictions on the production, biomass, and species  
581 richness of benthic invertebrate communities. *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, **63**, 822-830.

583 Hiddink, J.G., Johnson, A.F., Kingham, R. & Hinz, H. (2011) Could our fisheries be more  
584 productive? Indirect negative effects of bottom trawl fisheries on fish condition.  
585 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **48**, 1441-1449.

586 Hiddink, J.G., Jennings, S., Kaiser, M.J., Queiros, A.M., Duplisea, D.E. & Piet, G.J. (2006a)  
587 Cumulative impacts of seabed trawl disturbance on benthic biomass, production, and  
588 species richness in different habitats. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*  
589 *Sciences*, **63**, 721-736.

590 Hilborn, R. (2007) Reinterpreting the State of Fisheries and their Management. *Ecosystems*,  
591 **10**, 1362-1369.

592 Hinz, H., Prieto, V. & Kaiser, M.J. (2009) Trawl disturbance on benthic communities:  
593 chronic effects and experimental predictions. *Ecological Applications*, **19**, 761-773.

594 Jennings, S., Dinmore, T.A., Duplisea, D.E., Warr, K.J. & Lancaster, J.E. (2001) Trawling  
595 disturbance can modify benthic production processes. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **70**,  
596 459-475.

597 Kaiser, M.J., Clarke, K.R., Hinz, H., Austen, M.C.V., Somerfield, P.J. & Karakassis, I.  
598 (2006) Global analysis of response and recovery of benthic biota to fishing. *Marine*  
599 *Ecology Progress Series*, **311**, 1-14.

600 Liaw, A. & Wiener, M. (2002) Classification & regression by randomForest. *R News*, **2**, 18-  
601 22.

602 McLoughlin, R., Rayns, N., Smith, A.D.M., Johnson, D., Hobday, A.J. & Smith, T. (2008)  
603 Implementing the ecosystem approach in commonwealth (Federally)-managed  
604 fisheries. *The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries*. (ed. by G. Bianchi and H.R.  
605 Skjoldal), pp. pp. 293-300. FAO.

- 606 Pearman, P.B., D'Amen, M., Graham, C.H., Thuiller, W. & Zimmermann, N.E. (2010)  
 607 Within-taxon niche structure: niche conservatism, divergence and predicted effects of  
 608 climate change. *Ecography*, **33**, 990-1003.
- 609 Piet, G.J. & Quirijns, F.J. (2009) The importance of scale for fishing impact estimations.  
 610 *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **66**, 829-835.
- 611 Pitcher, C.R. (2016) Case Study — Footprint of Trawling. In. Australia State of the  
 612 Environment 2016 — Marine Chapter. Department of the Environment and Energy,  
 613 Canberra, Australia.
- 614 Pitcher, C.R., Ellis, N., Althaus, F., Williams, A. & McLeod, I. (2015) Predicting benthic  
 615 impacts and recovery to support biodiversity management in the South-east Marine  
 616 Region. *Marine Biodiversity Hub, National Environmental Research Program, Final*  
 617 *report 2011–2015*. (ed. by N.J. Bax and P. Hedge), pp. 24–25. Report to Department  
 618 of the Environment., Canberra, Australia.
- 619 Pitcher, C.R., Williams, A., Ellis, N., Althaus, F., McLeod, I., Bustamante, R.H., Kenyon, R.  
 620 & Fuller, M. (2016d) Implications of current spatial management measures on AFMA  
 621 ERAs for habitats — FRDC Project No 2014/204. CSIRO Oceans & Atmosphere,  
 622 Brisbane, 50 p. ISBN: 978-1-4863-0685-5.
- 623 Pitcher, C.R., Ellis, N., Venables, W.N., Wassenberg, T.J., Burrridge, C.Y., Smith, G.P.,  
 624 Browne, M., Pantus, F., Poiner, I.R., Doherty, P.J., Hooper, J.N.A. & Gribble, N.  
 625 (2016a) Effects of trawling on sessile megabenthos in the Great Barrier Reef and  
 626 evaluation of the efficacy of management strategies. *ICES Journal of Marine Science:*  
 627 *Journal du Conseil*, **73**, i115-i126.
- 628 Pitcher, C.R., Ellis, N., Jennings, S., Hiddink, J.G., Mazon, T.M., Kaiser, M.J., Kangas, M.,  
 629 McConnaughey, R.A., Parma, A., Rijnsdorp, A.D., Suuronen, P., Collie, J.S.,  
 630 Amoroso, R., Hughes, K. & Hilborn, R. (2016c) Estimating the sustainability of  
 631 towed fishing-gear impacts on seabed habitats: a simple quantitative risk assessment  
 632 method applicable to data-limited fisheries. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*,  
 633 doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12705.
- 634 Pitcher, C.R., Miller, M., Morello, E., Fry, G., Strzelecki, J., McLeod, I., Slawinski, D., Ellis,  
 635 N., Thomson, D., Bearham, D., Keesing, J., Donovan, A., Mortimer, N., Babcock, R.,  
 636 Fromont, J., Gomez, O., Hosie, A., Hara, A., Moore, G., Morrison, S., Kirkendale, L.,  
 637 Whisson, C., Richards, Z., Bryce, M., Marsh, L., Naughton, K., O'Loughlin, M.,  
 638 O'Hara, T., Boddington, D. & Huisman, J. (2016b) Environmental Pressures:  
 639 Regional Biodiversity — Pilbara Seabed Biodiversity Mapping & Characterisation.  
 640 Final report, CSIRO Oceans & Atmosphere, 61 p.
- 641 Pitcher, C.R., Doherty, P., Arnold, P., Hooper, J., Gribble, N., Bartlett, C., Browne, M.,  
 642 Campbell, N., Cannard, T., Cappel, M., Carini, G., Chalmers, S., Cheers, S.,  
 643 Chetwynd, D., Colefax, A., Coles, R., Cook, S., Davie, P., De'ath, G., Devereux, D.,  
 644 Done, B., Donovan, T., Ehrke, B., Ellis, N., Ericson, G., Fellegara, I., Forcey, K.,  
 645 Furey, M., Gledhill, D., Good, N., Gordon, S., Haywood, M., Hendriks, P., Jacobsen,  
 646 I., Johnson, J., Jones, M., Kinninmoth, S., Kistle, S., Last, P., Leite, A., Marks, S.,  
 647 McLeod, I., Oczkowicz, S., Robinson, M., Rose, C., Seabright, D., Sheils, J.,  
 648 Sherlock, M., Skelton, P., Smith, D., Smith, G., Speare, P., Stowar, M., Strickland, C.,

649 Van der Geest, C., Venables, W., Walsh, C., Wassenberg, T., Welna, A. & Yearsley,  
650 G. (2007b) Seabed Biodiversity on the Continental Shelf of the Great Barrier Reef  
651 World Heritage Area. AIMS/CSIRO/QM/QDPI CRC Reef Research Task Final  
652 Report. 315 pp.

653 Pitcher, R., Venables, B., Browne, M., Doherty, P. & De'ath, G. (2007a) Indicators of  
654 protection levels for seabed habitats, species and assemblages on the continental shelf  
655 of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area. In, Unpublished report to the Marine  
656 and Tropical Sciences Research Facility. Reef and Rainforest Research Centre  
657 Limited, Cairns (75pp.). [http://www.cmar.csiro.au/e-print/open/2007/pitchercr\\_x.pdf](http://www.cmar.csiro.au/e-print/open/2007/pitchercr_x.pdf).

658 Ponder, W., Hutchings, P. & Chapman, R. (2002) Overview of the conservation of Australian  
659 marine invertebrates. *Report for Environment Australia, Australian Museum, Sydney*,

660 R Core Team (2015) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation  
661 for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org/)  
662 [project.org/](http://www.R-project.org/)

663 Rice, J.C. (2005) Benthic Habitats and the Effects of Fishing. *American Fisheries Society* (ed.  
664 by P.W. Barnes and J.T. Thomas), pp. 41-58, American Fisheries Society Symposium  
665 41.

666 Roberts, C.M., Branch, G., Bustamante, R.H., Castilla, J.C., Dugan, J., Halpern, B.S.,  
667 Lafferty, K.D., Leslie, H., Lubchenco, J., McArdle, D., Ruckelshaus, M. & Warner,  
668 R.R. (2003) Application of ecological criteria in selecting marine reserves and  
669 developing reserve networks. *Ecological Applications*, **13**, 215-228.

670 Roberts, D.W. (2010) *labdsv: Ordination and Multivariate Analysis for Ecology*. R package  
671 version 1.4-1. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=labdsv>

672 Rosenberg, R., Blomqvist, M., Nilsson, H.C., Cederwall, H. & Dimming, A. (2004) Marine  
673 quality assessment by use of benthic species-abundance distributions: a proposed new  
674 protocol within the European Union Water Framework Directive. *Marine Pollution*  
675 *Bulletin*, **49**, 728-739.

676 Schmiing, M., Diogo, H., Serrão Santos, R. & Afonso, P. (2014) Marine conservation of  
677 multispecies and multi-use areas with various conservation objectives and targets.  
678 *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*,

679 Spalding, M.D., Fox, H.E., Allen, G.R., Davidson, N., Ferdaña, Z.A., Finlayson, M., Halpern,  
680 B.S., Jorge, M.A., Lombana, A., Lourie, S.A., Martin, K.D., McManus, E., Molnar, J.,  
681 Recchia, C.A. & Robertson, J. (2007) Marine Ecoregions of the World: A  
682 Bioregionalization of Coastal and Shelf Areas. *BioScience*, **57**, 573-583.

683 Stefansson, G. & Rosenberg, A.A. (2005) Combining control measures for more effective  
684 management of fisheries under uncertainty: quotas, effort limitation and protected  
685 areas. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, **360**, 133-46.

686 Sutcliffe, P.R., Mellin, C., Pitcher, C.R., Possingham, H.P. & Caley, M.J. (2014) Regional-  
687 scale patterns and predictors of species richness and abundance across twelve major  
688 tropical inter-reef taxa. *Ecography*, **37**, 162-171.

- 689 Tagliapietra, D. & Sigovini, M. (2010) Benthic fauna: collection and identification of  
690 microbenthic invertebrates. *NEAR Curriculum in Natural Environmental Science*,  
691 *Terre et Environnement*, **88**, 253–261.
- 692 Thrush, S.F. & Dayton, P.K. (2002) Disturbance to Marine Benthic Habitats by Trawling and  
693 Dredging: Implications for Marine Biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology and*  
694 *Systematics*, **33**, 449-473.
- 695 Ward, T.J. & Hegerl, E. (2003) Marine protected areas in ecosystem-based management of  
696 fisheries. In: (ed. D.O.T.E.a.H. Parks Australia South).
- 697

## FIGURES

**Fig. 1** Map of nine study regions around Australia showing locations of sites sampled by one or more of four gear-types.

**Fig. 2** Flowchart of the steps used to predict and map benthos-group distributions from raw survey data (left). The box (right) details the three approaches (Single Gear Approach, Multiple Gears Approach and Disparate Datasets Approach) and the process used to create the site-by-taxon matrix from collated benthic survey datasets. Note that survey gears with non-overlapping benthos composition (e.g. epifauna in trawls vs. infauna in grabs), were not combined, but treated separately as single gears.

**Fig. 3** Map of areas where trawling is prohibited within Australia's Exclusive Economic Zone EEZ (see Table S3; Table S4).


**Fig. 4** Area statistics of the study regions: a) relative total areas of the study regions (for absolute area, see Table S6); b) percentage area within regions comprising fishery closures, reserves and overlap of both; and c) percentage area within regions comprising grid cells with trawl effort recorded, and the trawl footprint area for multi-year exposure and single-year exposure.

**Fig. 5** Predicted distributions of three groupings of sea-urchin taxa (class: Echinoidea) in the Gulf of Carpentaria (Figure 1 – study region 1). Areas that exclude trawling are represented by black polygons with parallel hatching. Each group has different trawl exposure (Group

721 1=1.6%; Group 2=6.4%; Group 3=4.7%) and protection (Group 1=6.4%; Group 2=17.5%;  
722 Group 3=5.8%) as proportions of their abundance. See Tables S7 and S8 for group and model  
723 details.



724

725 **Fig. 6** Box plots summarizing protection and trawl exposure of 134 benthos groups, as  
726 proportions of their abundance in each a) region, and b) taxa group — calculated by mapping  
727 their distributions against marine reserves and fishery closure boundaries — and their  
728 combination, and against the multi-year footprint of trawling. Horizontal lines denote the  
729 medians and box plot error bars represents the variation of different benthos groups.




**Figure 1.**







**Figure 2.**



**Figure 3.**




**Figure 4.**



**Figure 5.**

a)



b)




Figure 6.